

## Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

**Application No.**

09/934,091

**Applicant(s)**

BLESSENT ET AL.

**Examiner**

Robert C. Scheibel

**Art Unit**

2616

**All Participants:**(1) Robert C. Scheibel.(2) Roberta Young (Reg. No. 53,818).**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 6 July 2006**Time:** 5:30 EDT**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*The rejection of claim 1 under obviousness-type double patenting.*

Claims discussed:

*1 and 6.*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner indicated the double patenting rejection and some of the claim objections contained in the enclosed action. Mr. Oehling (Reg. No. 40,471) is assigned to this case and is out of the country on assignment. Ms. Young requested that an Office Action be submitted to allow the issues to be formally documented for Mr. Oehling and to allow the client to respond accordingly..